

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 659

RC 013 713

TITLE The Initial Screening and Diagnostic Assessment of Students of Limited English Proficiency.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Los Angeles. National Dissemination and Assessment Center.
SPONS AGENCY Maryland State Dept. of Education, Baltimore.; Office of Bilingual Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 56p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cloze Procedure; *Diagnostic Tests; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Information Sources; *Language Proficiency; Language Skills; *Limited English Speaking; *Screening Tests; Staff Development; *Student Placement; *Test Selection

ABSTRACT

Intended for personnel in local school districts and state departments of education, this handbook presents suggested procedures and resources for the initial screening and diagnostic assessment of the English language skills of students whose dominant language is other than English. The handbook deals with the initial screening for placement and diagnostic assessment of English language skills at entry point. The diagnostic assessment procedures described deal with estimating the student's proficiency in the four English language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The following factors that must be taken into account in selecting tests that measure the English language proficiency of children whose dominant language is other than English are discussed: test appropriateness and linguistic, sociocultural, and psychometric criteria. Staff training is briefly discussed and a sample outline of an in-service program is provided. A listing of major sources of helpful measures includes the addresses of the 3 dissemination and assessment centers, 18 materials development centers, and 20 training resource centers. Appendices include a copy of the English Language P-Rating Sheet (Reading and Writing), a procedure for rating oral language proficiency, an excerpt from "Cloze Testing for Your Classroom," and a sample instructional plan (bilingual/ESOL). (NQA)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED224659

RC 01 3713



*the initial
screening and
diagnostic assessment
of students of
limited english proficiency*

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. F. Leyba

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

This publication was prepared under the auspices of the United States Office of Education, Office of Bilingual Education, and in cooperation with the Maryland State Department of Education.

The development of this publication was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or the policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

This publication was printed with funds provided by Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by Public Law 93.380. Therefore, it is in the public domain and may be reproduced for local use, except for sections expressly prohibited.

National Dissemination and Assessment Center
California State University, Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

1980

This guide is being disseminated in the present form to provide assistance to participating LEAs in the area of initial screening and diagnostic testing to determine participation in bilingual education programs. This guide has been developed, cognizant of the fact that the **Lau Remedies** are presently undergoing revision. When these law revisions are formally approved, they will then be incorporated into a comprehensive handbook for publication and dissemination. At that time, this guide should be read in the light of the revisions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Purpose	1
II. Suggested Procedures for Initial Screening and Diagnostic Assessment	2
Initial Screening	2
Diagnostic Assessment	6
III. Criteria for the Selection of Tests	7
Test Appropriateness	7
Linguistic Criteria	8
Sociocultural Criteria	11
Psychometric Criteria	11
Other Criteria	12
IV. Staff Training	12
V. Resources	15
Sources of Test Reviews	15
National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education	16
National Institute of Education	16
Dissemination and Assessment Centers	16
Materials Development Centers	17
Training and Resource Centers	22
 Appendices:	
Appendix 1: English Language P-Rating Sheet (Reading and Writing)	28
Appendix 2: A Procedure for Rating Oral Language Proficiency	29
Appendix 3: Excerpt from "Cloze Testing for Your Classroom"	42
Appendix 4: Sample Instructional Plan (Bilingual/ESOL)	48

CONTRIBUTORS AND MEMBERS OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE

Eli Adame
Bilingual General
Assistance Center
Teacher's College
Columbia University
Box 11
New York, NY 10027

Ann A. Beusch
Specialist, Foreign Languages—
ESOL and Bilingual Education
Maryland State Department of Education
Division of Instruction
P.O. Box 8717 - BWI Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240

Gretal Clark
Bilingual Specialist
Massachusetts State
Department of Education
Northeast Regional
Education Center
1551 Osgood Street
North Andover, MA 01845

Gilbert J. Cuevas
Miami General Assistance
Center for Bilingual
Education (Lau)
Merrick Building 319
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, FL 33124

C. Michael Darcy
Bureau of Bilingual Education
New York State Department
of Education
Albany, NY 12234

Celeste E. Freytes
Bilingual Program
University of Puerto Rico
San Juan, PR

Gerard Hoffman
Bilingual General
Assistance Center
Teacher's College
Columbia University
Box 11
New York, NY 10027

Herminio Martinez
Bilingual General
Assistance Center
Teacher's College
Columbia University
Box 11
New York, NY 10027

James Murphy
MERIT Center
Temple University
Ritter Annex 995
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Anne S. Richardson
Specialist in Reading/
Learning Problems
Maryland State Department
of Education
Division of Instruction
P.O. Box 8717 - BWI Airport
Baltimore, MD 21240

Charlene Rivera
Language Assessment
Project Director
InterAmerica
1500 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 800
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Blanca M. Westgate
Education Program Specialist
Office of Education/Office
of Bilingual Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Reporters Building - 421
Washington, D.C. 20202

THE INITIAL SCREENING AND DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS OF LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY*

I.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this handbook is a very practical one, i.e., to provide personnel in local school districts and state departments of education with suggested procedures and resources for the initial screening and diagnostic assessment of the English language skills of those students whose dominant language is other than English.

The recommendations made in this document address only the following aspects of general assessment and evaluation in bilingual/multicultural programs:

1. The handbook deals with the initial screening for placement and the diagnostic assessment of English language skills at **entry point**, i.e., when a child enters school or a school program for the first time.
2. The diagnostic assessment procedures described deal with estimating the student's proficiency in the four English language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). These procedures for estimating proficiency in the four English language skills at entry point, however comprehensive and systematic they may be, are but a first step in meeting the educational needs of children whose dominant language is other

* Prepared under the auspices of the United States Office of Education, Office of Bilingual Education, and in cooperation with the Maryland State Department of Education. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the United States Office of Education and no official endorsement by the United States Office of Education should be inferred.

than English. Good screening and diagnostic procedures at point of entry are essential to the design and development of effective instructional programs for students of limited English proficiency.

II.

SUGGESTED PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL SCREENING AND DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT

1. Appoint a coordinator, or coordinators, in the school system to assume responsibility for initial screening and diagnostic assessment. The coordinator should have had adequate preparation in the following areas:
 - Tests and measurements
 - Selection and administration of tests
 - Diagnostic language instruments and interpretation of scores
 - Processes of language acquisition
 - Bilingual/multicultural education
 - Teaching English to speakers of other languages
2. Set up systematic assessment procedures to be used uniformly throughout the school system. The following is a suggested set of procedures to be implemented by a coordinator.

Initial Screening

1. Modify regular registration and parent interview forms used for all students to include information on the dominant language used in the home. Translate the forms into the parent's native language or use an interpreter. Include the following basic questions:

- a. Which language is used in the home?*
 - b. Is it used exclusively or intermittently for oral communication?
 - c. Can the child read and write in the native language?
2. Interview all children whose home language is reported as "other than English." The interviewer should be from the child's own ethnic background and should be experienced in conversing with children of this age. The setting in which the interview takes place should be as relaxed as possible. Ask the child a series of questions in English and in his/her native language on the following topics:
- Name
 - Age
 - Where he/she lives
 - Brothers and sisters
 - Pets
 - Objects in the room: name, size, color, shape
 - Previous exposure to, or formal study of, English
3. Assign a **temporary** general classification for each student whose home language is reported as "other than English" and who has been interviewed. The following are language proficiency classifications suggested in the **Lau Remedies**:
- O **Monolingual—other language**
 "Monolingual speaker of the language other

*In a "Home Language Survey" used in California, the following questions are asked: (1) Which language did your son or daughter learn when he or she first began to talk? (2) What language does your son or daughter most frequently use at home? (3) What language do you use most frequently to speak to your son or daughter? (4) Name the language most often spoken by the adults at home.

than English (speaks the language other than English exclusively)."

OE¹ Predominant other language, some English
 "Predominantly speaks the language other than English (speaks mostly the language other than English, but speaks some English)."

OE² Bilingual
 "Bilingual (speaks both the language other than English and English with equal ease)."

OE³ Predominant English, some other language
 "Predominantly speaks English (speaks mostly English, but some of the language other than English)."

E Monolingual—English
 "Monolingual speaker of English (speaks English exclusively)."

4. Assign **temporary** proficiency ratings for each student's **listening and speaking skills in English**. The following is a sample rating scale, based on guidelines developed by the Foreign Service Institute (see Appendix 2 for a more complete description of the categories):

P-0 No practical speaking proficiency (the student may know a few isolated words and phrases that are of little practical use).

P-1 Elementary proficiency (the student has language proficiency adequate to meet routine daily needs and minimum courtesy requirements and is able to follow simple directions).

P-2 Limited proficiency (the student can carry on casual conversation regarding concrete sub-

jects, family, recreational experiences, and can handle most frequently used syntactical structures).

- P-3 Basic proficiency [the student can participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and school-related topics within his/her range of experience; accent and occasional errors (in complex constructions) do not interfere with understanding by native speakers of English.]
 - P-4 Full proficiency (the student shows a high degree of fluency and an extensive, precise vocabulary in all school situations; can handle informal interpreting from and into English).
 - P-5 Native or bilingual proficiency (the student shows proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker of English in his/her age group; shows breadth of vocabulary and appropriate use of idioms and colloquialisms).
5. Set up a separate file on each child whose home language is reported as "other than English." Include all pertinent information including interviews, Lau ratings, and proficiency ratings. Flag the files of those with Lau ratings of O and OE¹ and proficiency ratings of P-O, P-1, P-2, and P-3.
 6. Prepare tentative instructional plans based on the results of the initial screening. Begin with those students whose folders have been flagged (refer to Appendix 4 for a sample instructional plan).

Diagnostic Assessment

1. Organize observation teams including not only classroom teachers, but paraprofessionals and parent volunteers as well as other school personnel to observe individual students over a period of approximately one month (the size and composition of the observation team may vary from student to student; a minimum would be one professional or one paraprofessional volunteer).
2. Provide training sessions for members of the teams on assessment of English and native language proficiency skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Each English language skill should be rated on P-O to P-5 scale (described more fully in Appendix 2). Other relevant observational data, such as observations of behavior related to adjustment in school situations should also be recorded.
3. At the conclusion of the observation period, arrange for formal diagnostic testing of English language proficiency. Include testing of native-language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) if appropriate tests are available. Before choosing a test, refer to Section III entitled "Criteria for the Selection of Tests."
4. Evaluate the test results together with the ESOL specialist, bilingual education specialist, or regular classroom teacher. Discuss the test results and proposed instructional plan with one or both parents.
5. Modify, as needed, the classification and proficiency ratings of the student as well as the existing instructional plans.

III.

CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF TESTS

The measurement of language proficiency is a difficult process. Because of the complexity of language structure, acquisition, and usage, language skills may not be adequately measured by any one single test. **It is recommended that students not be categorized or definitively placed on the basis of any one test.** Many kinds of information from multiple sources, including observation, should be used in measuring the student's strengths and weaknesses in English native language skills.

The language modalities essential to the full assessment of language proficiency are: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The criteria presented in this section are to be applied in selecting tests that measure the English language proficiency of children whose dominant language is other than English. Some criteria apply only to the oral aspects of language. Other criteria are applicable to all four language domains. **The following criteria should be considered carefully by the coordinator in selecting an appropriate test or tests.**

Test Appropriateness

1. Is the test designed only for placement purposes (i.e., for assignment to basic, intermediate, or advanced instruction in English) or does the test also reveal strengths and weaknesses in specific skill areas such as listening and speaking?

It is not always possible to determine the type of test by merely examining the items. Check the test manual or descriptive literature for technical information regarding its appropriateness for different uses. Be

wary of instruments that are not designed for a specific purpose. Some tests can be used not only for placement purposes, but also for diagnosing problem areas in the language skills; in these cases, however, both purposes must have been considered in their design, construction, and revision.

2. Is the instrument appropriate for local program needs? The test should fit the goals and content of the local program or curriculum. The coordinator may find that performance tests (writing samples, speaking on selected topics, and evidences of functional reading comprehension) are more appropriate than formal tests for diagnosing the English language needs of entering students. A diagnostic test of specific grammatical items such as verb tenses and types of clauses will be of little value in working with such students.

Linguistic Criteria

1. Which language skills does the test measure? All four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—should be measured. Oral language proficiency involves both listening comprehension and speaking. Therefore, language assessment procedures that measure listening comprehension alone are not valid for diagnosing the needs of students who are limited in English.

Reading tests for students who are limited in English may pose problems because of cultural differences. Reading tests often rely on memory, which can be hampered by the student's unfamiliarity with cultural

elements in the reading passage. The use of other procedures, such as the **Cloze Test**, might be more appropriate and useful (see Appendix 3 for a sample of a **Cloze Test**). The measurement of writing skills should stress the production of samples of writing rather than "fill-in-the-blank" items. Although grammatical structure, vocabulary, and pronunciation are all essential aspects of language, testing of these components separately provides a poor indicator of general language proficiency. Vocabulary in particular, is a weak measure of general language proficiency because it is so closely bound to the cultural and experiential background of the speaker. Range and depth of vocabulary are critical to educational development and should certainly be measured, but in conjunction with other language skills and with due regard for interpretation in terms of cultural differences.

2. Does the instrument measure natural language use? Many tests of language proficiency involve tasks such as transformations, substitutions, translations, and imitations. Such tasks, which involve either mimicry or the conscious application of grammatical rules, do not reflect natural language use. Listening comprehension and speaking, for instance, can be measured in an interview situation. Another example of comprehensive oral language testing is to ask the child to describe what he/she sees in a picture as opposed to the examiner's asking specific questions about the picture. Similarly, listening comprehension and writing skills can be measured by writing out simple messages or directions that are given orally.

The vast majority of tests available for assessing language proficiency measure isolated features of the language. Choosing "correct" grammatical constructions or "appropriate" vocabulary items are examples of this type of testing, which may not provide a true measure of communicative skills.

3. Does the test measure language skills at appropriate developmental levels?

As children learn their first language, developmental levels are closely related to age. Generally, the language used by a child in kindergarten is less complex than that used by a student in a higher grade. In learning a second language, however, proficiency depends on length of time spent in studying the new language and the opportunities available to use it. A child in the fifth grade who has been in the United States for three years will generally be more advanced in English language skills than a cousin in the ninth grade who has just arrived in this country without having had previous English instruction.

As an appropriate basis for comparison, students who are limited in English should be compared with native speakers of English in their own age group. It is essential, therefore, to determine whether there are different versions of any given test of language proficiency adapted for different age groups. Illustrations used to stimulate speaking, for the purpose of measuring oral language proficiency, must be appropriate for the age group to be tested. Pictures of young children on a playground are not likely to interest junior high school students. Complicated pictures may tend to confuse younger children.

Soclocultural Criteria

Is the instrument culturally appropriate?

Items on a test that reflect one cultural group may not be understood by children who come from different cultural backgrounds. For example, children accustomed to playing in small groups under the supervision of an adult may be bewildered by a picture of a crowded American playground filled with unattended children.

Children who are recent immigrants require some time to become adjusted to any type of testing, however simple it may appear. It is recommended that informal methods, such as teacher observation, be used until the child is ready for formal testing.

Psychometric Criteria

1. Is the instrument valid?

A valid test is one that provides an accurate measure of what it claims to measure. For example, if a test is supposed to measure oral language fluency, it should correlate highly (.65 to .85) with criterion measures of oral fluency (obtained by trained observers in real-life situations). Many tests, however, report no criterion-related validity studies at all. Others report studies that use as criteria language behaviors (such as vocabulary or grammatical structures) different from those that the test is supposed to measure.

2. Is the instrument reliable?

A reliable language test is one that provides consistent measurements of language skills—consistent from day-to-day and consistent from one form to another equivalent form. Information in the test

manual should indicate a reliability quotient of at least .80 for comparison of groups, and preferably .90 or higher for assessment of individuals. Tests that involve subjective judgment in the appraisal of language skills, such as the evaluation of speaking and writing samples, tend to be less reliable than multiple-choice tests, for instance. Specialized training and detailed and uniform scoring procedures, as well as sample scored responses for purposes of comparison, are essential if one is to ensure accurate evaluation of speaking and writing samples.

Other Criteria

The following factors must also be taken into account in selecting an appropriate test:

- Cost of the test
- Equipment required, such as cassette recorders
- Need for trained test administrators
- Time required to administer and score tests
- Complexity of scoring
- Feasibility of machine-scoring

IV.

STAFF TRAINING

Planning for staff training should be based on a needs assessment study that would involve obtaining the reactions of teachers, paraprofessional aides, supervisors of bilingual education, and project administrators.

The findings of such a study can be used as the basis for deliberations by a planning committee (composed of

the coordinator, project administrators, teachers, para-professional aides, and representatives of teacher-training institutions).

One of the important decisions to be made by the planning committee is whether the in-service training will involve a workshop developed locally, a course at a local college or university, or a state-wide or regional workshop sponsored by a state department or a Training and Resource Center.

Decisions also need to be made by the planning committee on the topics to be covered, which should be determined by the findings of the needs assessment study. Since courses should vary according to local needs, the following sample outline of an in-service program is intended to be illustrative only.

Title of In-service Program: The Initial Screening and Diagnostic Assessment of Students of Limited-English Proficiency

Length of Program: 15 weeks—3 hours per week

Credit: Three (3) university credits

Outline:

Week 1: Profiles of students with limited English proficiency. What is being done to help each of these students?

Week 2: Stages in second-language acquisition. Factors affecting the learning of a second language.

- Week 3:** Types of programs: ESOL/Bilingual. Methodology: strategies and techniques for teaching the child with limited English proficiency.
- Week 4:** Why initial screening and diagnostic assessment?
Legal mandates; value in individualizing instruction, etc.
- Week 5:** Procedures and processes for effective screening and diagnostic assessment. Involving the child and his/her parent(s) in the process of initial screening and diagnostic assessment.
- Week 6:** Initial screening and diagnostic assessment techniques.
Practicum in initial screening and diagnostic assessment (role-playing and simulation).
- Weeks 7 and 8:** Practicum in initial screening and diagnostic assessment (with incoming students).
- Week 9:** Preparation of instructional plans based on initial screening and diagnostic assessment.
- Week 10:** Observational techniques—practicum on observation.
- Week 11:** Criteria for the selection of tests—an overview.
- Week 12:** Examination and critique of tests—practicum.
- Week 13:** Administration of tests—practicum.
- Weeks 14 and 15:** Diagnosis and preparation of instructional plans.

V. RESOURCES

Although it would be impossible to list all the resources available, an attempt has been made to list the major sources of helpful measures and information concerning their characteristics and uses.

- Sources of test reviews:
 - Center for Bilingual Education, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. **Assessment Instruments in Bilingual Education: A Descriptive Catalog of 342 Oral and Written Tests.** Los Angeles: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, 1978.
 - **A Guide to Assessment Instruments for Limited English Speaking Students.** New York: Santillana Publishing Co., 1978.
 - **Bilingual Resources**, section on test reviews. (Published by the National Dissemination and Assessment Center, Los Angeles.)
 - **The Bilingual Review**, occasional test reviews. (Published by the Department of Foreign Languages, York College, CUNY.)
 - **The Mental Measurements Yearbooks.** Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1941, 1949, 1953, 1959, 1961, 1972, 1978.
 - **Newsletter**, occasional test reviews. (Published by Bilingual Education Service Center, Arlington Heights, Illinois.)

- **Oral Language Tests for Bilingual Students: An Evaluation of Language Dominance and Proficiency Instruments.** Portland: Center for Bilingual Education, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1976.
- **Centers:**
 - **National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education**
1500 Wilson Boulevard
Suite 802
Rosslyn, VA 22209
Director: Joel Gomez
The Clearinghouse provides a national coordinating mechanism for collecting, analyzing, and disseminating information about bilingual education related programs.
 - **National Institute of Education**
1200 19th N.W.
Room 802
Washington, DC 20208
Acting Director: Michael Timpane
NIE is a federal agency responsible for conducting research on bilingual education.
- **Dissemination and Assessment Centers**
Dissemination and Assessment Centers are responsible for providing a host of research, development, and evaluation services to Training Resource Centers (TRCs) and Materials Development Centers (MDCs). They are involved in needs assessment, field testing, technical assistance, and publishing and disseminating Title VII project-developed educational products and selected educational products.
- **National Dissemination and Assessment Center**
California State University, Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032
Director: Charles F. Leyba
Spanish, Asian, and Pacific area languages

- **National Assessment and Dissemination Center**
 Lesley College
 49 Washington Avenue
 Cambridge, MA 02140
 Director: John Correiro
 Spanish, French, Portuguese, Italian, Greek, Chinese,
 Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, and Russian
- **Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education**
 Education Service Center—Region XIII
 7703 North Lamar Boulevard
 Austin, TX 78752
 Director: Nilda Garcia
 Spanish and Native American
- **Materials Development Centers**
 Materials Development Centers develop bilingual/multicultural instructional materials for bilingual education programs in local educational agencies (LEAs) and institutions of higher education (IHEs) in the language of their particular target group.
- **National Bilingual Materials Development Center**
 University of Alaska
 2223 Spenard Road
 Anchorage, AK 99503
 Director: Tupou Pulu
 Eastern and Western Aleut, Gwich' In, Inupiaq, Yup'ik, Siberian Yupik, Alutliq (Sugpiaq), Upper Tanana, Upper Kushokwin, Dena'ina, Koyukon, Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian, Ahtena, Cree, Crow, Hidasta, Shoshone, Arapaho, Yakima, Pit River, Navajo, Cherokee, Seminole, Mohawk, Northern Cheyenne

- Arizona Bilingual Materials Development Center
University of Arizona
College of Education
Box 601
Tucson, AZ 85721
Director: Elizabeth Antley
Spanish
- National Asian Center for Bilingual Education
10801 National Boulevard
Suite 404
Los Angeles, CA 90064
Director: Mieko S. Han
Chinese, Japanese, and Korean
- Asian American Bilingual Center
Berkeley Unified School District
2168 Shattuck
Third Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
Director: Linda Wing
Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Pilipino
- National Portuguese Materials Development Center
Brown University Center for Portuguese and
Bilingual Studies
Box 0
Providence, RI 02912
Director: João Botelho
Portuguese
- National Multilingual/Multicultural Materials
Development Center
California State Polytechnic University,
Pomona
3801 West Temple Avenue
Pomona, CA 91768
Director: Roberto L. Ortiz
Spanish

- **Pacific Area Languages Materials Development Center**
University of Hawaii at Manoa
c/o Palm Development Center
Social Sciences and Linguistics Institute
Porteus Hall 704
2424 Maile Way
Honolulu, HI 96822
Director: Robert Gibson
Ilokano, Samoan, Marshallese, Ponapean,
Kosraean, Chamorro, Palauan, Carolinian,
Yapese, and Trukese
- **Spanish Curricula Development Center**
7100 N.W. 17th Avenue
Miami, FL 33147
Director: Felicia Gil
Spanish
- **Social Studies Materials Development Center
for Greek Speaking Minority Children**
Florida State University
Department of Educational Research Development
and Foundations
302 Education Building
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Director: Bryon Massialas
Greek

- **Mid-American Center for Bilingual Materials Development**
University of Iowa
College of Education
N 315 Oakdale Campus
Iowa City, IA 52242
Director: Lawrence Stolurow
Spanish and Indo-Chinese
- **Arabic Language Bilingual Materials Development Center**
University of Michigan
School of Education
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
Director: Frederick Bertolaet
Arabic
- **National Materials Development Center for French and Portuguese**
168 South River Road
Bedford, NH 03102
Director: Norman Dubé
French and Portuguese
- **Asian Bilingual Curriculum Development Center**
Seton Hall University
4400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, NJ 07079
Director: Byounghye Chang
Chinese, Japanese, and Korean
- **Native American Materials Development Center**
407 Rio Grande Boulevard, N.W.
Albuquerque, NM 87103
Director: Gloria Emerson
Navajo

- **Northeast Center for Curriculum Development**
City of New York Board of Education
Community School District #7
778 Forest Avenue
Bronx, NY 10456
Director: Aurea Rodríguez
Greek, Italian, Russian, Spanish, and Hebrew
- **Asian American Bilingual Cross Cultural Materials Development Center**
San Francisco State University
Frederick Burk Foundation
1640 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132
Director: George Woo
Chinese and Pilipino
- **Bilingual Materials Development Center**
6000 Camp Bowie Boulevard
Ft. Worth, TX 76116
Director: José López
Spanish
- **The National Center for the Development of Bilingual Curriculum—Dallas**
Dallas Independent School District
Nathan Adams School
3700 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75204
Director: Juan D. Solís
Spanish and French

- **Training Resource Centers**

Training Resource Centers serve a clearly defined geographic area and provide supportive services to bilingual/bicultural LEA projects and IHEs. They train LEA professional and paraprofessional staff and community members and are responsible for pilot testing materials developed by MDCs with cooperating LEA projects and state education agencies (SEAs).

- **Indian Education Resource Training Center**

College of Education
Arizona State University
Center for Indian Education
302 Farmer
Tempe, AZ 85281
Director: Emerson Horace
Spanish, Papago, and Pima

- **BABEL Resource Center**

2168 Shattuck Avenue
Second Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
Director: Roberto Cruz
Spanish, Chinese, Portuguese, Korean, Tagalog, Japanese,
Pilipino, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, and Punjabi

- **Comprehensive Educational Assistance Center**

California State University at Fullerton
800 North State College Boulevard
Fullerton, CA 92634
Director: Anthony M. Vega
Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Korean, Samoan, Tagalog,
Japanese, Pilipino, Vietnamese, Ilocano, and Laotian

- **Cross Cultural Resource Center**
California State University at Sacramento
Department of Anthropology
6000 "J" Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
Director: Steven Arvizu
Spanish, Palute, Samoan, Chamorro, Kosraen, Ponapean,
Carolinian, Trukese, Marshallese, Palauan, Ulithian,
Walerian, Yapese, Tagalog, Chinese languages, Japanese,
Punjabi, and Hawaiian languages
- **Bilingual Education Training Resource Center**
Institute for Cultural Pluralism
5544½ Hardy Avenue
San Diego, CA 92182
Director: Rafael Fernández
Spanish, Pilipino, and Vietnamese
- **Training Resource Center**
The Regents of the University of Colorado
Willard Box 141
Boulder, CO 80309
Director: James Brandford
Spanish
- **Midwest Resource Center for Bilingual/Bicultural Education**
Bilingual Education Service Center
500 South Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights, IL 60005
Director: Guillermo De Hoogh
Spanish, Greek, Arabic, Vietnamese, Potawatomi, Ojibwa,
Chaldean, Ibo, Yoroba, Igala, Hausa, and Sarsi

- **University of Southwestern Louisiana Bilingual/Bicultural Resource Center**
University of Southwestern Louisiana
P.O. Box 43410
East University Avenue
Lafayette, LA 70504
Director: Robert Fontenot
French, Italian, Spanish, Vietnamese, and Hungarian
- **Boston University Bilingual Resource and Training Center**
Boston University
School of Education
765 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
Director: Antonio Simões
Chinese, French (French-Canadian), Greek, Armenian, Passamaquoddy, Italian, Haitian-Creole, Spanish, and Portuguese
- **Southwest Bilingual Education Training Resource Center**
University of New Mexico
College of Education
Albuquerque, NM 87131
Director: Teresa Salazar
Navajo, Spanish, Tewa, Towa, Karesan, Ute, and Mescalero/Apache
- **Southeast Cooperative Training and Resource Center**
New Mexico State University
College of Education
Box 3 A C
Las Cruces, NM 88003
Director: Atilano Valencia
Spanish

- **Regional Bilingual Training Resource Center**
City of New York Board of Education
Center for Bilingual Education
131 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, NY 11201
Director: Carmen Velkas
Greek, Italian, Spanish, French/Haitian-Creole, Yiddish,
Hebrew, Russian, Mohawk, Portuguese, Japanese, and Arabic
- **Merit Center**
Temple University
Ritter Hall Annex
Room 995
Broad Street and Montgomery Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Director: Frank X. Sutman
Spanish, Chinese, Greek, Italian, Korean, Vietnamese,
Yiddish, Arabic, Pennsylvania Dutch/German, Choctaw,
Tagalog, Cherokee, French Creole, and Russian
- **Multilingual/Multicultural Resource and
Training Center**
Rhode Island College
Horace Mann Hall
600 Mt. Pleasant Avenue
Providence, RI 02908
Director: Adeline Becker
Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, French Creole (Cape Verdean)
- **South Central Bilingual Resource Center**
Region XIII
Education Service Center
7703 North Lamar Boulevard
Austin, TX 78752
Director: Jesus García
Spanish

- **Federation Bilingual Training and Resource Center**
Texas Women's University Station
Box 23778
Denton, TX 76204
Director: Amado Robledo
Spanish, Choctaw, Greek, Seminole, and Cherokee
- **South Central Bilingual Resource Center**
Texas A & I University
Campus Box 152
Kingsville, TX 78363
Director: Mario A. Benítez
Spanish
- **Delta Bilingual/Bicultural Education Training Resource Center**
Academic Affairs
University of Utah
309 Milton Bennion Hall
Salt Lake City, UT 84112
Director: Dale Vigil
Crow, Lakota, Chinese, Spanish, Ute, Japanese, Cheyenne, Navajo, and Korean
- **Bilingual Education Technical Assistance Center**
Tacoma School District #10
708 South "G" Street
Tacoma, WA 98405
Director: Pío de Cano
Chinese, Pilipino, Japanese, Korean, Samoan, Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Russian

- **National Bilingual Training Resource Center**
University of Washington
College of Education
406 Hall Health GS 25
Seattle, WA 98195
Director: Joseph Beard
Spanish, Alaskan, and Native American languages

APPENDIX 1

ENGLISH LANGUAGE P-RATING SHEET
(READING AND WRITING)

Writing	Reading
P-1 Unable to write at all.	Unable to recognize any words.
P-2 Can print or write only short basic sentences. Punctuation limited to capitals and terminals. Frequent mistakes in structure, spelling, and vocabulary.	Inadequate decoding skills. Recognizes only a few isolated words.
P-3 Uses some phrases and dependent clauses but makes frequent errors, sometimes obscuring meaning. Has trouble with transitions and commas.	Inadequate grasp of vocabulary and structure seriously interferes with comprehension. Aims for single-sentence comprehension.
P-4 Makes a few significant errors but meaning is understood and organization evident. Writing reveals definite signs of non-native English background.	Understands most material in familiar areas written for his/her age level. Occasional explanation is necessary. Relates accurately information in paragraph or story read.
P-5 Makes very few significant errors. Can switch styles according to need. Writing approximates that of a native writer.	Approximates reading level of native speakers of his/her age and ability level.

APPENDIX 2**A PROCEDURE FOR RATING
ORAL LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY***

Jon Jonz
Testing and Evaluation for Bilinguals
Lancaster-Lebanon Intermediate Unit
East Petersburg, Pennsylvania

* This appendix is based on guidelines published by the Foreign Service Institute and by the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface.....	31
I. Guidelines for Using the Impression Scale.....	32
Accent	32
Syntax.....	33
Vocabulary	33
Fluency	34
Comprehension.....	34
II. Directions for Using the Conversion Scale	35
III. Directions for Deriving P-Rating From "Total of Converted Scores".	35
IV. P-Rating Descriptions	36
P-0 No Practical Speaking Proficiency	36
P-1 Elementary Proficiency.....	36
P-2 Limited Proficiency	37
P-3 Basic Proficiency	38
P-4 Full Proficiency	38
P-5 Native or Bilingual Proficiency	39
V. Interpretation of "+" on "P" Rating.....	39
VI. Scoring Sheet.....	40

PREFACE

THE ORAL RATING PROCEDURE

The materials in this section are adapted from materials that the United States Foreign Service Institute currently employs in assigning oral proficiency ratings.

The Oral Rating Procedure is based on the premise that language teachers are the single most valuable source of information on student language proficiency. Following the guide, a teacher can quickly and easily record judgments of students' oral language proficiency on the Scoring Sheet (pp. 40-41). Those judgments, recorded on the upper half of the Scoring Sheet (the Impression Scale), are constrained only by the global descriptions of language performance outlined on pages 32, 33, and 34 of the Guide.

Once teacher impressions have been recorded, it is a simple matter to change those impression ratings into converted scores, using the lower half of the Scoring Sheet (the Conversion Scale). Directions for using this Scale are contained on page 35 of the Guide. It is then an equally easy matter to use the P-Rating Descriptions (pp.36-39) as a standard base for communicating teacher impressions.

During the period of time when these materials were being adopted, the following four general directions were developed:

1. Ratings should be based on at least 25 hours of observation in and out of the classroom (over a period of about 4-6 weeks).

2. Whenever possible, two raters should judge the student and the results should be pooled.
3. An impression rating should be based entirely on observed language behavior, not on the results of tests.
4. If a rater is uncertain about a particular rating, he/she should observe the student in question with specific reference to the Performance Factor in question.

It should be noted, also, that this procedure and a similar rating scale forms the basis of the procedure that is used to report the results of initial placement interviews for newly enrolled students.

I.

GUIDELINES FOR USING THE IMPRESSION SCALE

Accent

1. Pronunciation usually unintelligible.
2. Frequent gross errors and a very heavy accent make understanding difficult, and make frequent repetition necessary.
3. "Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening; mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding.
4. Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.
5. No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
6. Native-like pronunciation with little trace of "foreign accent."

Syntax

1. Grammar almost entirely inaccurate except in stock phrases.
2. Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns; errors frequently obscure communication.
3. Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled; errors cause occasional irritation and misunderstanding.
4. Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that cause misunderstanding.
5. Few errors with no pattern of failure.
6. Native-like use of syntactical patterns.

Vocabulary

1. Vocabulary inadequate for even the simplest conversation.
2. Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas.
3. Choice of words sometimes inaccurate; limitations of vocabulary prevent discussion of some common school-related and social topics.
4. Vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests; general vocabulary permits discussion of most non-technical subjects with some circumlocutions.
5. Vocabulary broad and precise; adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied social situations.
6. Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of native speaker of comparable age and education.

Fluency

1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is virtually impossible.
2. Speech is very slow and uneven except for short sentences or routine remarks.
3. Speech is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be left uncompleted.
4. Speech is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.
5. Speech is effortless and smooth, but perceptibly non-native in speed and evenness.
6. Speech on all topics as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's.

Comprehension

1. Understands too little for the simplest type of conversation.
2. Understands only slow, very simple speech on common topics; requires constant repetition and rephrasing.
3. Understands careful, somewhat simplified speech directed to him/her, with frequent repetition and rephrasing.
4. Understands quite well normal educated speech directed to him/her, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing.
5. Understands everything in normal educated conversation except for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally rapid or slurred speech.
6. Understands everything in both formal and colloquial speech that a native speaker of comparable age and education would be expected to understand.

II.

DIRECTIONS FOR USING THE CONVERSION SCALE (on Scoring Sheet)

Procedure

Find, and carry to the space on the right, the credit to be given for each mark on the Impression Scale for Performance Factors. For example, a check mark in position "3" on the "ACCENT" scale is given a credit of "2"; a check mark in position "5" on the "FLUENCY" scale is given a credit of "10," and the like. Add the credits to find the "Total of Converted Scores." Place this score in the box provided as well as in the box in the upper right-hand corner of the Scoring Sheet.

III.

DIRECTIONS FOR DERIVING P-RATING FROM "TOTAL OF CONVERTED SCORES"

Procedure

The final P-Rating is to be obtained from the "Total of Converted Scores" by use of the following table:

Score	Rating	Score	Rating	Score	Rating
16-25	P-0 +	43-52	P-2	73-82	P-3 +
26-32	P-1	53-62	P-2 +	83-92	P-4
33-42	P-1 +	63-72	P-3	93-99	P-4 +

Record the final P-Rating in the appropriate space in the box in the upper right-hand corner of the Scoring Sheet.

IV.

P-RATING DESCRIPTIONS

P-0 No Practical Speaking Proficiency

May know a few isolated words and phrases that are of little practical use.

P-1 Elementary Proficiency

Able to satisfy routine daily needs and minimum courtesy requirements. Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to the student; within the scope of his/her very limited language experience, can understand simple questions and statements, allowing for slowed speech, repetition, or paraphrase; speaking vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs; errors in pronunciation and grammar are frequent, but can be understood by a native speaker accustomed to dealing with non-target language speakers attempting to speak the target language. While topics that are "very familiar" and elementary needs may vary considerably from one individual to the next, any student at this level should be able to follow simple classroom directions, express basic needs (both biological and situational), ask and give simple directions with respect to school, home, or neighborhood, deal appropriately with routine school processes and, perhaps, tell time.

The student at this level normally makes errors even in structures that are quite simple and common. Vocabulary is limited to the type of situations mentioned, and even in these situations the student sometimes uses the wrong

word. Although pronunciation may be poor, the student makes the minimum necessary distinctions, including stress intonation, and tone patterns.

P-2 Limited Proficiency

Can handle most daily situations with confidence but not facility, including casual conversations about current events as well as work, play, family, and autobiographical information; can handle limited scholastic language requirements, needing help in handling any complications or difficulties; can get the gist of most conversations on non-technical subjects (i.e., topics that require no specialized knowledge) and has a speaking vocabulary sufficient to express himself/herself simply with some circumlocutions; accent, though often quite faulty, is intelligible; can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.

The student is able to talk in some detail about concrete subjects such as his/her own background, some current events, family, travel, experiences, recreational activities, school environment, and other familiar places. The student has enough control of the language to be able to join sentences in limited discourse. He/she has good control of the morphology of the language and of the most frequently used syntactic structures. Although vocabulary is sufficient to talk with confidence about the type of topics described above, the student's vocabulary fairly often reduces him/her to verbal groping or to momentary silence. A "foreign" intonation and rhythm may still be dominant.

P-3 Basic Proficiency

Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and school-related topics. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence and interest with reasonable ease; comprehension is quite complete for a normal rate of speech; vocabulary is broad enough that the student has to grope for a word; accent may be obviously foreign; control of grammar is good; errors never interfere with understanding, and rarely disturb the native speaker. Though the student has good control of grammar, he/she makes occasional errors in low-frequency structures and in the most complex frequent structures. A "foreign" pronunciation, though apparent, is not distracting.

P-4 Full Proficiency

Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to school-related needs. Can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of experience with a high degree of fluency and precision of vocabulary; would rarely be taken for a native speaker, but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations; errors of pronunciation and grammar are quite rare; can handle informal interpreting from and into the language. Although the subject matter that the student is able to handle at this level may not differ very much from that of level "P-3," the student is able to use the language in all school situations, and can express thoughts almost as one would in the native language (assuming that the student is "P-5" in his/her own language). The student has

nearly perfect grammar and speaks the language with extensive and precise vocabulary. Although the student may still have an accent, he/she very rarely mispronounces the language.

P-5 Native or Bilingual Proficiency

Speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker of his/her age group. Has complete fluency in the language on all levels of speech and is fully acceptable to native speakers in all of its features, including breadth of vocabulary and idiom, colloquialisms, and pertinent cultural references. The student is able to use the language in all conceivable non-technical and semi-technical school subjects in a manner equivalent to that of a well-informed native speaker of the language of his/her age group. The student may still have a detectable accent, although it interferes in no way with communication.

V.

INTERPRETATION OF "+" ON "P" RATING

A base level (0, 1, 2, 3, 4), modified by a "plus" (+), is interpreted as described in the following examples:

1. The student will usually perform at a particular base level, but often during the rating period it is apparent to the rater that he/she falls short of that level.

Example—At times Raul Cruz is a "2," but he frequently lapses into errors ascribed to level "1." He would be described as a "1+."

2. The student fulfills the vocabulary requirements of the next higher level, but falls short of that level in grammar.

Example—Maria Cruz is a "3" in vocabulary, but her grammar does not exceed a "2." She would be described as a "2+."

3. The student fulfills the grammar requirements of the next higher base level, but falls short of that level in vocabulary.

Example—Juan Cruz is a "3" in grammar, but his vocabulary does not exceed a "2." He would be described as a "2+."

VI. SCORING SHEET*

STUDENT'S NAME _____

STUDENT'S SCHOOL _____

TODAY'S DATE ____/____/____ RATER'S NAME _____

TOTAL OF
CONVERTED
SCORES _____

P-RATING:
(see p. 35)

* Based on Foreign Service Institute guidelines.

PART A: IMPRESSION SCALE FOR PERFORMANCE FACTORS

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
ACCENT	non-native...	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	native
GRAMMAR	inaccurate...	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	accurate
VOCABULARY	inadequate ..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	adequate
FLUENCY	broken	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	smooth
COMPREHENSION ..	Incomplete ..	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	complete

PART B: CONVERSION SCALE (FOR CHANGING IMPRESSION RATINGS TO CONVERTED SCORES)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
ACCENT	0	1	2	2	3	4	_____
GRAMMAR	6	12	18	24	30	36	_____
VOCABULARY	4	8	12	16	20	24	_____
FLUENCY	2	4	6	8	10	12	_____
COMPREHENSION	4	8	12	15	19	23	_____

**TOTAL OF
CONVERTED SCORES**

APPENDIX 3

EXCERPT FROM
"CLOZE TESTING FOR YOUR CLASSROOM"

James M. Murphy
The BESL Center
New Holland,
Pennsylvania

CLOZE TESTING FOR YOUR CLASSROOM

Have you ever wondered if a popular child's book would be good reading for your Bilingual/ESL children? Most of us would like to use well known children's books with our children, but we can never be sure if the reading level will be appropriate or not. Here's how you can tell: use a cloze test like the one below. Cloze testing is by far one of the easiest and fastest methods yet devised for a teacher to measure reading difficulty.

The following cloze passage is taken from **Charlotte's Web** by E.B. White—a perennial favorite of school children everywhere. To find out if **Charlotte's Web** is “readable” for your children, make copies of this test and try it out. Directions for scoring and interpreting are on pages 46 and 47.

WILBUR



Fern loved Wilbur more than anything. She loved to stroke him, to feed him, _____ put him to bed. Every morning _____ soon as she got up, she _____ his milk, tied his bib on, _____ held the bottle for him. Every _____, when the school bus stopped in _____ of her house, she jumped out _____ ran to the kitchen to fix _____ bottle for him. She fed him _____ at suppertime, and again just before _____ to bed. Mrs. Arable gave him _____ feeding around noontime each day, when Fern* _____ away in school. Wilbur loved his _____, and he was never happier than _____ Fern was warming up a bottle _____ him. He would stand and gaze _____ at her with adoring eyes.

For _____ first few days of his life, Wilbur* _____ allowed to live in a box _____ the stove in the kitchen. Then, _____ Mrs. Arable

* In making cloze tests skip proper names—just go to the next word and continue making blanks as usual. Numbers, too, should probably be treated in this way.

complained, he was moved _____ a bigger box in the woodshed. _____ two weeks of age, he was _____ outdoors. It was apple-blossom time, _____ the days were getting warmer. Mr. Arable* _____ a small yard specially for Wilbur under an apple tree, and gave him a large wooden box full of straw, with a doorway cut in it so he could walk in and out as he pleased.

HOW TO MAKE A CLOZE TEST

1. Select a self-contained passage of approximately 150 to 200 words taken from one of the books or materials you wish to use with your students.
2. Go through the passage and systematically delete every seventh word leaving the FIRST AND LAST SENTENCES INTACT. Try to make exactly 25 blanks as this makes scoring much easier. Important! Do not **choose** the items to be deleted: Use **every** seventh word until you reach 25 blanks.
3. Type up a ditto making a blank for every deleted word. A blank of ten typewriter spaces is a good size, like this: _____. Now you have the test.

* In making cloze tests skip proper names—just go to the next word and continue making blanks as usual. Numbers, too, should probably be treated in this way.

HOW TO ADMINISTER A CLOZE TEST

1. Be sure to give clear instructions to the students. They are to fill in **one** word in each of the blanks. There is no one "proper word" or "correct word" that fits in each blank. Several alternatives may be perfectly satisfactory as long as they make sense. The important thing to remember is that for each blank there is room for **only one word**.
2. It is sometimes wise to do a few easy sample sentences on the blackboard before students actually take the test. This gives the teacher a chance to clear up any confusions that might arise.
3. Give the test and allow as much time as is needed (within practical limits) for all students to complete it. Don't rush them.

HOW TO SCORE THE TEST

1. Go through the tests and count up the number of words that are right. For our children words are right if they are acceptable in the context.
2. Now calculate the **percent of correct answers**. If you have 25 blanks you can do this quite easily by merely multiplying the number correct by 4.
3. Compare your percentages against the table to see if the book is appropriate.

Percent of Correct Answers*	Comprehension Level	Appropriate for your Class?
above 53%	Independent	Yes , it will make easy reading. It's especially appropriate for enjoyment, homework or independent activities.
between 44%-53%	Instructional	Yes , it will make challenging reading for work within class.
below 44%	frustration	No , it is too difficult. It will probably discourage both you and your students.

Words Deleted from Charlotte's Web:

1. to	6. front	11. a	16. up	21. to
2. as	7. and	12. was	17. the	22. At
3. warmed	8. another	13. milk	18. was	23. moved
4. and	9. again	14. when	19. near	24. and
5. afternoon	10. going	15. for	20. when	25. fixed

* These percentages are taken from an article by J. Anderson, "Selecting a Suitable 'Reader': Procedures for Teachers to Assess Language Difficulty," *RELC Journal*, Vol. 2, pp. 35-42. It is probably unwise to interpret these percentages rigidly—you can shift them several points one way or the other.

APPENDIX 4**SAMPLE INSTRUCTIONAL PLAN
(Bilingual/ESOL)**

1. Student's Name: Marla X
2. Grade: 4
3. Native Language: Spanish
4. Preliminary Assessment: September 1

Components

- | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|---|
| A. English-Listening: | P-2 | Carries out some simple directions and seems to understand simple questions. |
| English-Speaking: | P-0 | Very shy—will respond with smile or nod. |
| English-Reading: | P-0 | |
| English-Writing: | P-0 | |
| B. Spanish-Listening: | P-5 | Probably above age group. |
| Spanish-Speaking: | P-4 + | Limited by shyness but shows good vocabulary level; short sentences but correct sentence structure; clear speech. |
| Spanish-Reading | P-5 | Comprehension excellent. |
| Spanish-Writing: | P-4 | Wrote only four sentences; minor spelling errors; correct sentence structure; good vocabulary. |

Comments: Marla is quite shy, but has already made two friends in her class. The interview with her parents, preliminary observations and her

previous school records would seem to indicate that she learns quickly and easily. Her attention span is good.

5. Instructional Plan

A. Dates: September 8 - October 15

B. Re-evaluation: October 15

C. Objectives:

1. To develop English listening skills for (a) classroom and school directions, (b) identification of classroom objects and materials, (c) simple questions, (d) simple "social" conversations.
2. To develop English speaking skills for (a) responses to classroom directions, (b) identification of classroom objects and materials, (c) simple basic questions/answers, (d) greetings.
3. To maintain progress, consistent with that of pupils in grade 4 of similar activity, in (a) mathematics concepts, (b) social studies, (c) science.
4. To maintain progress consistent with age ability and grade level in Spanish language arts and Hispanic culture.

D. Procedures

All day

1. Assigned four "buddies" for lunch, recess, classroom, etc.

**60 minutes
per day**

2. Provide services of bilingual tutor for math, social studies, science, Spanish language arts, and Hispanic culture.

**35 minutes
per day**

3. Give daily instruction in English communication skills.

**30 minutes
per day**

4. Request services of parent volunteers for individualized assistance.
5. Regular art, music, and physical education.

E. Sample daily schedule for: Maria

9:00- 9:30 a.m.— Paraprofessional aide or volunteer reviews previous day's lesson; work on math terminology in English.

9:20- 9:50 a.m.— Bilingual tutor reviews and previews social studies and science concepts.

9:50-10:20 a.m.— Bilingual tutor: reading/writing practice in Spanish; folk songs of Mexico.

10:40-12:20 p.m.— With regular class for math and oral language activities.

12:20- 1:00 p.m.— Lunch; playground.

1:00- 1:35 p.m.— Instruction in English communication skills; (a) classroom directions, (b) greetings, (c) bingo game on identification of sample objects, (d) number game.

1:35- 1:50 p.m.— To library with "buddies" (learning how to use library).

2:00- 3:00 p.m.— With regular class for science, physical education, and class meeting.